

REMARKS

Claim objections

The antecedent bases to which the examiner objects are believed corrected in the attached amended claims.

Claim rejections – 35 USC §112

The recitations of “possible divided sliding surfaces”, “possibly divided fronts” have been deleted from the claims.

Claim rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4 are rejected as being unpatentable over 2,607,370 to Anderson in view of 4,465,104 to Wittman et al. As discussed below, the amended claims are believed to distinguish over Anderson, such that the claims are now believed to be patentable over the combination of references cited.

Anderson discloses a conventional slip having a single sliding surface of uniform angle. The present invention, on the other hand, discloses a slip having two separate sliding surfaces of differing angles relative to the longitudinal axis of the plug. As Claim 1 was originally written, however, Anderson does disclose a “front” (i.e. the front end of the slip itself), that has a different angle than the sliding surface (i.e., the “front” is vertical). The claims as amended now clearly specify that it is a front sliding surface that must have an angle different than the angle of a second sliding surface. Anderson does not disclose this feature of a front sliding surface. It is believed therefore that the claims as rewritten are patentably distinct over Anderson, either alone or in combination with Wittman.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, favourable reconsideration is solicited.